UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/780,490	02/09/2001	Marco Graziano	M-9823 US	8135

23639 7590 10/08/2003

BINGHAM, MCCUTCHEN LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO, SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4067

EXAMINER	
BARNES, CRYSTAL J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2121	10

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/780,490	GRAZIANO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Crystal J. Barnes	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 August 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 February 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The amendment to the specification, filed 18 August 2003 as paper no. 9, overcomes the objection.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's arguments, see paper no. 9 Claim Rejection section, filed 18 August 2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 1-5, 7-13, 15, 16, 25, 26 and 30 under 35 USC 102(e) and claims 6, 14, 17-24, 27-29 and 31-42 under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the web-based host" in lines 4-5 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 17, 21, 23-26, 28-32, 34-38 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,175,860 B1 to Gaucher.

As per claim 1, the Gaucher reference discloses a method for remotely monitoring and/or controlling a home device performed on a web-based host, the

method comprising establishing a connection (see column 6 lines 38-40, "registering" and lines 41-43, "modem 20") with a remote device (see column 6 lines 34-36, "PDA device 50"); receiving monitoring and/or control information (see column 6 lines 43-47, "perform various functions" and lines 54-58, "route information directly to user") from the remote device (see column 6 lines 34-36, "PDA device 50"); establishing a connection (see column 6 lines 38-40, "registering" and lines 41-43, "modem 20") with a home (see figure 3 and column 4 lines 48-51, "home or office"); and communicating the monitoring and/or control information to the home (see column 6 lines 29-35, "network box 16"), wherein the monitoring and/or control information causes monitoring information (see column 6 lines 43-47, "perform various functions" and lines 54-58, "route information directly to user") to be obtained (see column 6 lines 15-33, "constantly monitors") from a home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") in the home (see figure 3 and column 4 lines 48-51, "home or office") and/or causes the a home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") in the home (see figure 3 and column 4 lines 48-51, "home or office") to be controlled (see column 5 lines 61-63, "controlled").

As per claim 5, the Gaucher reference discloses receiving home device status information (see column 6 lines 22-33, "diagnostic information") in response to the step of communicating the monitoring and/or control information (see column 6 lines 29-35, "network box 16") from the web-based host (see column 6 lines 30-33, "master computer 12") to the home (see figure 3 and column 4 lines 48-51, "home or office") and communicating the home device status information (see column 6 lines 22-33, "diagnostic information") to the remote device (see column 6 lines 34-36, "PDA device 50").

As per claim 7, the Gaucher reference discloses the remote device (see column 6 lines 34-36, "PDA device 50") is a wireless telephone (see column 6 lines 36-38, "cordless or cellular telephone"), a wireless personal digital assistant (see column 6 lines 34-36, "PDA device 50"), or a wireless computer.

As per claim 8, the Gaucher reference discloses the remote device is a wired telephone (see column 6 lines 41-43, "telephone line"), a wired personal digital assistant, or a wired computer (see column 6 lines 30-33, "office computer").

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further claim 17 contains limitations cited in claim 1; therefore claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 21, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and further claim 21 contains limitations cited in claim 5; therefore claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

As per claim 23, the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated and further claim 23 contains limitations cited in claim 7; therefore claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 7.

As per claim 24, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and further claim 24 contains limitations cited in claim 8; therefore claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 8.

As per claim 25, the Gaucher reference discloses a method for monitoring and/or controlling a home device performed on a home attendant, the method comprising establishing a connection (see column 6 lines 38-40, "registering" and lines 41-43, "modem 20") with a web-based host(see figure 3 and column 4 lines 48-65, "network box 16, computer 12"); receiving monitoring and/or control information (see column 6 lines 43-47, "perform various functions" and lines 54-58, "route information directly to user") from the web-based host (see figure 3 and column 4 lines 48-65, "network box 16, computer 12").

As per claim 26, the Gaucher reference discloses communicating the monitoring and/or control information (see column 6 lines 43-47, "perform various functions" and lines 54-58, "route information directly to user") to a home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") thereby causing monitoring information causes monitoring information (see column 6 lines 54-58, "route information directly to user") to be obtained (see column 6 lines 15-33, "constantly monitors") from the home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") and/or causing the home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") to be controlled (see column 5 lines 61-63, "controlled").

As per claim 28, the Gaucher reference discloses communicating with a home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") via a radio frequency connection (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 33-35 "air" and lines 50-52, "RF field 15", column 6 lines 4-5, "antenna 72").

As per claim 29, the Gaucher reference discloses communicating with a home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") via a powerline connection (see figure 3 and column 4 lines 49-51 and column 5 lines 44-47, "AC power network 14").

As per claim 30, the Gaucher reference discloses the home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") is a stand-alone device (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 54-58, "appliance 40"), a peripheral device (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 44-47, "printer 31"), a personal computer (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 54-58, "office appliance"), or a television set-top box (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 54-58, "household appliance").

As per claim 31, the Gaucher reference discloses an apparatus for monitoring and/or controlling a home device, the apparatus comprising a microprocessor (see column 4 lines 55-60, "master computer 12"); a memory (see column 12 lines 41-42, "memory storage device") connected to the microprocessor (see column 4 lines 55-60, "master computer 12"); and one or more computer programs (see columns 4-5 lines 66-2, "software") executable by the microprocessor (see column 4 lines 55-60, "master computer 12"), wherein the computer programs (see columns 4-5 lines 66-2, "software") comprise computer instructions for establishing a connection with a web-based host (see figure 3 and column 4 lines 48-65, "network box 16"); and receiving monitoring and/or control information (see column 6 lines 43-47, "perform various functions" and lines 54-58,

"route information directly to user") from the web-based host (see figure 3 and column 4 lines 48-65, "network box 16").

As per claim 32, the Gaucher reference discloses communicating the monitoring and/or control information (see column 6 lines 43-47, "perform various functions" and lines 54-58, "route information directly to user") to a home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") thereby causing monitoring information causes monitoring information (see column 6 lines 54-58, "route information directly to user") to be obtained (see column 6 lines 15-33, "constantly monitors") from the home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") and/or causing the home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") to be controlled (see column 5 lines 61-63, "controlled").

As per claim 34, the Gaucher reference discloses communicating with a home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") via a radio frequency connection (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 33-35 "air" and lines 50-52, "RF field 15", column 6 lines 4-5, "antenna 72").

As per claim 35, the Gaucher reference discloses communicating with a home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") via a powerline

connection (see figure 3 and column 4 lines 49-51 and column 5 lines 44-47, "AC power network 14").

As per claim 36, the Gaucher reference discloses the home device (see column 5 lines 36-60, "appliance boxes 32a-32d") is a stand-alone device (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 54-58, "appliance 40"), a peripheral device (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 44-47, "printer 31"), a personal computer (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 54-58, "office appliance"), or a television set-top box (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 54-58, "household appliance").

As per claim 37, the rejection of claim 25 is incorporated and further claim 37 contains limitations cited in claim 25; therefore claim 37 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 25.

As per claim 38, the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated and further claim 38 contains limitations cited in claim 26; therefore claim 38 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 26.

As per claim 40, the rejection of claim 28 is incorporated and further claim 40 contains limitations cited in claim 28; therefore claim 40 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 28.

As per claim 41, the rejection of claim 29 is incorporated and further claim 41 contains limitations cited in claim 29; therefore claim 41 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 29.

As per claim 42, the rejection of claim 30 is incorporated and further claim 42 contains limitations cited in claim 30; therefore claim 42 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 30.

8. Claims 9, 11, 13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,546,419 B1 to Humpleman et al.

As per claim 9, the Humpleman et al. reference discloses a computer system for remotely monitoring and/or controlling a home device, the computer system comprising one or more computers (see figure 1 and column 4 lines 41-44, "server device 14") connected to one or more remote devices (see column 4 lines 41-44, "client device 12") via a network (see column 4 lines 41-44, "network 10"); one or more computer programs (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 14-24, "control program 20") executable by the computers (see column 5 lines 14-24, "client device 12"), wherein the computer programs (see column 5 lines 14-24, "control program 20") comprise computer instructions (see figure 4 and column 5 lines 33-45, "GCO 22")

for establishing a connection (see column 5 lines 46-55, "communication protocols") with a remote device (see figure 4 and column 5 lines 33-45, "client device 12"); receiving monitoring and/or control information (see columns 5-6 lines 65-4, "control state data 26") from the remote device (see columns 5-6 lines 65-4, "client device 12") establishing a connection with a home (see column 4 lines 32-33, "home network"); and communicating the monitoring and/or control information (see columns 5-6 lines 65-4, "control state data 26") to the home (see column 4 lines 32-33, "home network"), wherein the monitoring and/or control information (see columns 5-6 lines 65-4, "control state data 26") causes monitoring information to be obtained (see column 8 lines 33-39, "reading capabilities data") from a home device (see column 4 lines 44-47, "home device ") in the home and/or causes the a home device ("home device") in the home to be controlled (see column 5 lines 14-15 and 23-25, "control and command data"). Also see column 22 lines 58-66.

As per claim 11, the Humpleman et al. reference discloses the computer programs (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 14-24, "control program 20") further comprising communicating graphical interface files (see column 5 lines 9-13, "GCO 22") to the remote device ("client device 12"), the graphical interface files ("GCO 22") for allowing a user of the remote device ("client device 12") to select a home

device ("home device") to monitor and/or control ("sending and receiving data") and for allowing the user of the remote device ("client device 12") to specify how to monitor and/or control ("sending and receiving data") the home device ("home device"). Also see column 8 lines 6-14.

As per claim 13, the Humpleman et al. reference discloses the computer programs (see figure 3 and column 5 lines 14-24, "control program 20") further comprise computer instructions (see column 5 lines 9-13, "user interface description 22") for receiving home device status information (see column 5 lines 65-1, "status of control information") in response to the step of communicating the monitoring and/or control information (see columns 5-6 lines 65-4, "control state data 26") from the web-based host ("client device 12") to the home ("home network") and communicating the home device status information (see column 5 lines 65-1, "status of control information") to the remote device ("client device 12").

As per claim 15, the Humpleman et al. reference discloses the remote device ("client device 12") is a wireless telephone, a wireless personal digital assistant (see figure 5 and column 6 lines 41-42, "PDA (Remote C)"), or a wireless computer.

As per claim 16, the Humpleman et al. reference discloses the remote device ("client device 12") is a wired telephone, a wired personal digital assistant, or a wired computer (see figure 5 and column 6 lines 41-46, "PC").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,175,860 B1 to Gaucher in view of US Pub. No. 2003/0109938 A1 to Daum et al.

As per claim 2, the Gaucher reference does not expressly disclose receiving authentication information from the remote device and determining at the web-based host whether a user of the remote device has permission to access the home.

The Daum et al. reference discloses

(see figure 20 and paragraph 99, "... message authentication.")

(see paragraph 100, "... authenticate data ...")

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer network taught by the Gaucher reference to include the ECD taught by the Daum et al. reference to incorporate authentication into the home network.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate authentication into the home network to ensure that monitoring/controlling of devices was only performed by the intended devices/users.

As per claim 18, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further claim 18 contains limitations recited in claim 2; therefore claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

11. Claims 3 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,175,860 B1 to Gaucher in view of USPN 6,546,419 B1 to Humpleman et al.

As per claim 3, the Gaucher reference does not expressly disclose communicating graphical interface files to the remote device, the graphical

interface files for allowing a user of the remote device to select a home device to monitor and/or control and for allowing the user of the remote device to specify how to monitor and/or control the home device.

As per claim 19, the Gaucher reference does not expressly disclose the computer programs further comprising communicating graphical interface files for allowing a user of the remote device to select a home device to monitor and/or control and for allowing the user of the remote device to specify how to monitor and/or control the home device.

The Humpleman et al. reference discloses communicating graphical interface files (see column 5 lines 9-13, "GCO 22") to the remote device ("client device 12"), the graphical interface files ("GCO 22") for allowing a user of the remote device ("client device 12") to select a home device ("home device") to monitor and/or control ("sending and receiving data") and for allowing the user of the remote device ("client device 12") to specify how to monitor and/or control ("sending and receiving data") the home device ("home device"). Also see column 8 lines 6-14.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the PDA device taught by the Gaucher

reference with the PDA (Remote C) taught by the Humpleman et al. reference to illustrate the graphical user interface of the personal digital assistant.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to illustrate the graphical user interface of the personal digital assistant to further explain how the user/homeowner would interact with the network to monitor/control the indoor environment.

12. Claims 4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,175,860 B1 to Gaucher in view of USPN 6,553,336 B1 to Johnson et al.

As per claim 4, the Gaucher reference does not expressly disclose encrypting the monitoring and/or control information before the monitoring and/or control information is communicated to the home.

The Johnson et al. reference discloses

(see columns 20-21 lines 65-26, "... all transmitted messages can be encrypted to control access ...")

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer network taught by the Gaucher

reference with the encryption of transmitted messages as taught by the Johnson et al. reference.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine various teachings of Gaucher and Johnson et al. to provide a home network whereby users could interact with the network wherein the monitoring/control data is encrypted to facilitate secure monitoring/control of various devices.

As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated and further claim 20 contains limitations recited in claim 4; therefore claim 20 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4.

13. Claims 6, 22, 27, 33 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,175,860 B1 to Gaucher in view of USPN 6,236,332 B1 to Conkright et al. and further in view of USPN 6,553,336 B1 to Johnson et al.

As per claim 6, the Gaucher reference does not expressly disclose establishing a connection with the home if a home device in the home has detected an event, receiving information which describes the event, and communicating the information which describes the event to a user.

As per claim 27, the Gaucher reference does not expressly disclose communicating with a home device to determine whether the home device has detected an event; and if an event has been detected by the home device, establishing a secure connection with the web-based host and communicating the event to the web-based host.

The Conkright reference discloses

(see column 3 lines 28-34, "other communication media")

(see column 4 lines 4-7, "Computer 22 ... remote units 26 ... "alert" signals ...")

(see column 4 lines 49-51, "... alert notification subroutine.")

(see column 5 lines 53-60, "... alert condition ... alert signal data ... alert notification signal ...")

(see column 8 lines 35-39, "... alarm signal ... partial failure ...")

The Conkright reference does not expressly disclose a secure connection.

The Johnson et al. reference discloses

(see figure 8 and column 16 lines 21-24, "Standard capabilities of web-servers and browsers, such as secure socket layer (SSL) service ... required security and data access controls.")

(see column 16 lines 53-56, "... alarm condition, a notification ... notification list ...")

(see columns 20-21 lines 65-26, "... alarm notifications ...")

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer network taught by the Gaucher reference with the event notification of the control and monitoring system taught by the Conkright et al. reference and further include the secure standard capabilities of web-servers and browsers as taught by the Johnson et al. reference.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine various teachings of Gaucher, Conkright et al., and Johnson et al. to provide a secure home network whereby users could interact with the network and receive/inquire about event notifications to facilitate better monitoring/control of various devices.

As per claim 22, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated and further claim 22 contains limitations recited in claim 6; therefore claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

As per claim 33, the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated and further claim 33 contains limitations recited in claim 27; therefore claim 33 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 27.

As per claim 39, the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated and further claim 39 contains limitations recited in claim 27; therefore claim 39 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 27.

14. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,546,419 B1 to Humpleman et al. in view of USPN 6,496,862 B1 to Akatsu et al.

As per claim 10, the Humpleman et al. reference does not expressly disclose the computer programs further comprise computer instructions for receiving authentication information from the remote device and determining at the web-based host whether a user of the remote device has permission to access the home.

The Akatsu et al. reference discloses

(see columns 19-20 lines 64-7, "... IEEE 1394 node ... authenticate requests for data or commands from the remote client ...")

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the 1394 serial bus of the network as taught by the Humpleman et al. reference with the network system taught by the Akatsu et al. reference to incorporate authentication into the home network.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate authentication into the home network to ensure that monitoring/controlling of devices was only performed by the intended devices/users.

15. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,546,419 B1 to Humpleman et al. in view of USPN 6,553,336 B1 to Johnson et al.

As per claim 12, the Humpleman et al. reference does not expressly disclose the computer programs further comprise computer instructions for encrypting the monitoring and/or control information before the monitoring and/or control information is communicated to the home.

The Johnson et al. reference discloses

(see columns 20-21 lines 65-26, "... all transmitted messages can be encrypted to control access ...")

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer network taught by the Humpleman et al. reference with the encryption of transmitted messages as taught by the Johnson et al. reference.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine various teachings of Humpleman et al. and Johnson et al. to provide a home network whereby users could interact with the network wherein the monitoring/controlling data is encrypted to facilitate secure monitoring/controlling various devices.

16. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,546,419 B1 to Humpleman et al. in view of USPN 6,236,332 B1 to Conkright et al.

As per claim 14, the Humpleman et al. reference does not expressly disclose establishing a connection with the home if a home device in the home has detected an event, receiving information which describes the event, and communicating the information which describes the event to a user.

The Conkright reference discloses

(see column 3 lines 28-34, "other communication media")

(see column 4 lines 4-7, "Computer 22 ... remote units 26 ... "alert" signals ...")

(see column 4 lines 49-51, "... alert notification subroutine.")

(see column 5 lines 53-60, "... alert condition ... alert signal data ... alert notification signal ...")

(see column 8 lines 35-39, "... alarm signal ... partial failure ...")

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer network taught by the Gaucher reference with the event notification of the control and monitoring system taught by the Conkright et al. reference.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine various teachings of Gaucher and Conkright et al. to provide a home network whereby users could interact with the network and receive/inquire about event notifications to facilitate better monitoring/control of various devices.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to remote monitoring/controlling in general:

USPN 6,615,088 B1 to Myer et al.

USPN 6,606,994 to Chen

USPN 6,058,355 to Ahmed et al.

USPN 5,880,677 to Lestician

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Crystal J. Barnes whose telephone number is 703.306.5448. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday alternate Mondays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anil Khatri can be reached on 703.305.0282. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.305.3900.

Ramesh Patel
RAMESH PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10/6/03
For Anil Khatri

cjb
October 3, 2003